DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 873 JC 790 413

AUTHOR Moten, Charlyne H.
TITLE Policy Formulation in a Non-Unionized Community College: An Assessment of the Role Played by the Representative Body of the Faculty (Faculty Council) in the Decision-Making Process.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 29p.; Ed. D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Collective Bargaining; College Administration; *College Faculty; *College Governing Councils; Community Colleges; Conflict Resolution; Decision Making; *Faculty Organizations; *Junior Colleges; *Policy Formation; School Surveys; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken at Harrisburg Area Community College (Pennsylvania), a non-unionized institution, regarding the function and effectiveness of the Faculty Council in policy formation and decision-making. A three-part survey covered the role of the Council in policy-making, the function of standing committees, and possible alternative representative structures. Seventy-one full-time faculty (62%) completed the form. Of the respondents, 75% felt the faculty had a more limited role than administration in policy formation and 64% believed the faculty role should be expanded. A slight majority (51%) indicated that faculty standing committees did little meaningful work, but 56% also responded that committees were ineffective due to lack of participation by members. Comments made by faculty to open-ended questions in the survey also cited apathy on the part of some faculty as a reason for lack of committee effectiveness. Regarding alternative representation arrangements, 48% of responding faculty felt that an off-campus collective bargaining agency would not be more effective than the Faculty Council in resolving crisis situations. Forty-eight percent felt collective bargaining would not enhance faculty position in decision-making; 41% indicated it would. The survey form is appended. (DR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172873

POLICY FORMULATION IN A NON-UNIONIZED COMMUNITY COLLEGE: AN ASSESSMENT OF THE ROLE PLAYED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE BODY OF THE FACULTY (FACULTY COUNCIL) IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Charlyne H. Moten

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Charlyne H. Moten, M.S. Ed.

Harrisburg Area Community College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

JC 790 413

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	3
PROCEDURES	7
RESULTS	8
Table 1	9
Table 2	12
Table 3	14
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
REFERENCES	19
APENDIX	
FACULTY SURVEY	20

POLICY FORMULATION IN A NON-UNIONIZED COMMUNITY COLLEGE: AN ASSESSMENT OF THE ROLE PLAYED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE BODY OF THE FACULTY (FACULTY COUNCIL) IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Introduction

A survey of the literature suggests that community college faculty have been and still are actively seeking direct participation in the formulation of the policies and procedures that have direct bearing in the performance of their duties. Whether this participation is accomplished through the involvement of a faculty organization or through unionization of faculty must be decided by faculty on each campus.

Harrisburg Area Community College (HACC) is one of three community colleges in Pennsylvania which operates without a formal bargaining structure. At HACC the faculty, through the Faculty Organization and its representative body (Faculty Council), attempts to develop policy recommendations in its four main standing committees: Legislative and Finance; Curriculum, Instruction and Library; Personnel Policies; and Academic and Student Affairs. The policy recommendations made by the Council go to the Administrative Committee via the Faculty Council's Vice President, who is a member of the Committee.

In addition to the faculty standing committees, there are three College committees which presently have faculty representation; these committees are made up of faculty and administrators. The committees -- the College Budget Committee, the College Salary Committee, and the Building and Grounds Committee -- make recommendations to both the President and the Faculty Council.

College policy at HACC falls into four general categories, and the faculty committees are divided into subject areas which roughly parallel the policy areas. The four general categories can be described as follows: (1) Academic Policy includes curriculum development, instruction, and academic standards, (2) Personnel Policy includes both professional and classified staff matters, (3) Student Policy includes such areas as admission and records, social events, disciplinary committees, and grade appeals, and (4) general Administrative Policy includes the development of the budget and the maintenance and security of the facilities. Obviously these areas overlap and recommendations concerning them may come from any or all of the faculty committees.

In general, policy recommendations usually begin with groups below the level of the Administrative Committee and arrive after considerable debate. Policy can originate at any level, however. The important consideration is that most policy recommendations eventually arrive at the Administrative Committee for debate and suggestions before being sent to the President. There are two important exceptions to this procedure. Both the College Budget Committee and the College Salary Committee send their recommendations directly to the President for action. Although the reports of both committees are presented to the Faculty Council and the Administrative Committee, the reports are presented as action information items which can be debated but not altered unilaterally.

Faculty members at HACC are dependent upon the Faculty

Council, the representative body of the Faculty Organization, in order to have a role in the policy decision-making process on the campus. A descriptive study was made to assess the perceptions of the faculty as to the function and effectiveness of the Faculty Council in the formulation of policy on HACC's campus. A survey form was distributed to faculty members in order to carry out the purpose of this paper. (See Appendix A, page 20.)

Background and Significance

One of the goals listed in the Education Policy Systems' module text states:

> The student will be able to describe the setting of his own institution in terms of the constraints placed on that institution by various organizations participating in educational policy. In light of these constraints, current societal needs, and future direction for higher education, he will be able to assess the current policies of the institution where he is employed.... [7:5]

The above statements served as the impetus to investigate the findings of others in the area of faculty involvement in policy decision-making.

A Report of the AAHE Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations points out that first, "systematic procedures for faculty representation are essential to maintain or improve the quality of higher education in the United States" and that second, "this objective can best be achieved by shared authority through an active internal organization, preferably an academic senate...which can most effectively give expression and effect to the professional values and

competence of the faculty." The members of the Task Force further emphasize that "The concept of shared authority cannot be operational unless the faculty can influence basic decisions that condition its professional role.... Generally, faculty participation should begin at the lowest possible level in order to retain close contact with the problems encompassed by each issue." [10:56-57] Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson discuss the role of community college faculty in institutional policy-making by dividing the involvement of faculty into two categories: general institutional policies and curricula change. The authors state that in recent years faculty have strengthened their influence upon policy-making. They see the change as being the result of factors such as a "generally more aggressive teaching profession and the shift of community colleges from a subordinate position in public schools to independent status." [2:145-147] In discussing faculty involvement in curriculum change, the authors cite more faculty awareness of the external forces which influence curriculum change, especially the college-transfer programs and the legal requirements and limitations of the types of courses which can be offered by community colleges as mandated by state legislation. [2:148]

Gleaser, in discussing faculty power, states:

> Looking to the future, I found general agreement not only that the faculty of community colleges should be more involved in those decisions that affect them and their work but that such participation was likely to occur. The nature of that participation is of crucial importance in fulfilling college purposes. For the faculty member is in direct contact with the student, who is the focus of all efforts of the college. Plans

> programs and administrative structures all have their ultimate expression in student-teacher interactions. Will the organized power of faculty, which is taking a variety of forms throughout the nation, be utilized predominantly to make secure the place of the faculty member within the institution? Or will it have broader reach toward institutional goals? If the latter, it will not be enough to develop a deeper understanding of respective roles of faculty, board, and administration, nor to achieve greater skills in relationships. Beyond these, new patterns of organization may be required which are more suitable to the ends specified above. /5:147-148/

In The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges, members of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recommend that local boards "delegate substantial responsibility to the administration and the faculty as well as provide an opportunity for students to participate in decisions relating to educational policy and student affairs. In all too many community colleges, even though the board may delegate considerable responsibility to the administration, the faculty and students have very little involvement in policy decisions. This has been damaging to both faculty and student morale." [4:48] Richard C. Richardson, Jr., points out that "It is unrealistic to expect that administration operating in isolation from faculty can achieve the kind of change that is necessary to provide a secure and constructive future for community colleges. Faculty members acting in an adversary role to administration cannot expect to achieve significant change either." [11:61] Blocker, Bender, and Martorana observe that faculty groups can use some of the same tactics as individual faculty members use in gaining power and

influence. Such tactics include having expertise in the discipline, gaining national or professional recognition, or being involved in other distinguishing professional acts. Other avenues used to gain power and influence are serving on municipal boards, county commissions, or state commissions. Faculty can also form elite cliques which are capable of shaping an institution's direction. However, the authors view the external union as being a more powerful level to gain power and influence. [1:63]

A different view of faculty participation in policy-making is presented by Myron Lieberman:

> ...I happen to believe faculty senates, as envisaged and actually operative in most institutions, have inherent tendencies toward irresponsibility and totalitarianism. I do not mean to suggest that those who advocate faculty senates are irresponsible or totalitarian as individuals, or that their motives are anything other than noble and virtuous. Surely, however, we can agree that even intelligent and nobly motivated individuals may sometimes advocate policies whose practical effects are inconsistent with their sincerely held principles. For this reason, faculty senates are not beyond the pale of critical analysis because intelligent democratically oriented professors espouse them. [6:1]

Lieberman continues that some of the objectionable features of employee councils also characterize faculty senates: lack of funds as well as lack of negotiating, acturial, accounting, legal, and other expertise needed for effective representation. He further states that "those faculty members with an expertise useful for representation do not necessarily participate in the academic senate." According to Lieberman, some individual faculty members are not willing to spend time securing benefits

for the entire faculty. Volunteers -- qualified or not -- usually represent the faculty and are expected to perform the specialized services required. [6:2-7]

Procedures

The appended copy of a Faculty Survey was constructed to assess faculty attitudes toward the function and effectiveness of the Faculty Council and its Committees in the decision-making process. The statements included in the survey were a result of a review of the literature. [5, 9] Part I was constructed to elicit responses of a general nature concerning the involvement of Faculty Council in policy-making; Part II concerns the Faculty Council Committee structure as a whole; and Part III to elicit responses regarding the feasibility of an alternative faculty structure.

The first 25 statements of the survey listed a choice of six possible responses to each item: strongly agree, agree, strongly disagree, disagree, don't know, no answer. Items 26, 27, and 28 were open-ended questions.

A cover letter and the survey form was distributed to the offices of all currently employed full-time faculty members at HACC. Those faculty members on leave did not receive the form. A total number of 114 survey forms was distributed. 71 forms were returned -- a 62% response. No follow-up letter was sent to encourage additional responses.

The information received from the survey forms was hand-tallied and compiled into three tables. The responses to the three open-ended questions were sorted into groups as several responses were similar in nature.

Results

The data contained in Table 1 reflect the respondents' perceptions of the role of the faculty's representative body (Faculty Council) plays in the policy-making decisions on HACC's campus. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that policy decision-making on this campus is decentralized; forty-one percent agreed or strongly agreed. A greater disparity exists concerning the statement that there is wide faculty involvement in important decisions about how the college is run: fifty-nine percent disagreed or strongly disagreed while thirty-seven percent agreed or strongly agreed. In responding to the concept that faculty and administration arrive at decisions jointly, sixty-three percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed and thirty-one percent agreed or strongly agreed. Seventy-five percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed (twenty-four percent disagreed or strongly disagreed) that the Faculty Council plays a more limited role in policy formulation than the administration plays. It naturally follows that sixty-four percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the role the Faculty Council plays in the decision-making process should be increased. Of the respondents replying to whether their opinions are adequately represented in Faculty Council debates, forty-four percent agreed or strongly agreed, forty-two percent disagreed or strongly disagreed, and twelve percent either did not know or did not respond the the statement. The respondents were about evenly split in replying to whether Faculty Organization

meeting should be open to the entire campus community but non-members not having the privilege of the floor: forty-four percent agreed or strongly agreed and forty-two percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. The following table reflects the total number and percent of responses in each category.

Table 1

Role of Faculty Council in the Policy-making Decisions

1. Policy decision-making on this campus in decentralized.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	29	40	1	1	71
%	41	57	1	1	100

2. There is wide faculty involvement in important decisions about how the college is run.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	26	42	2	1	71
%	37	59	3	1	100

3. A concept of "shared governance" (faculty and administration arrive at decisions jointly) describes this campus fairly well.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	22	45	2	2	71
%	31	63	3	3	100

4. The representative body (Faculty Council) of our faculty plays a more limited role in policy formation than the administration plays.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	53	17	0	1	71
%	75	24	0	1	100

5. The role our representative body (Faculty Council) plays in the decision-making process on our campus should be increased.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	45	20	3	3	71
%	64	28	4	4	100

6. In Faculty Council debates, your opinions are adequately represented.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	32	30	6	3	71
%	44	42	8	4	100

7. Some Faculty Organization meetings should be open to the entire campus community, but non-members should not be given the privilege of the floor.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	32	30	6	3	71
%	44	42	8	4	100

Key: N = number of responses to each item
% = percent of responses to each item

SA/A = strongly agree, agree
SD/D = strongly disagree, disagree
DK = don't know
NA = no answer

Assessing faculty's perception of the effectiveness of Faculty Council's Standing Committees in the policy-making decisions is the subject matter of Table 2. In responding to the statement, "Committee work is more often a device to give the appearance of faculty participation than a genuine effort to bring about change," sixty percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed and thirty-eight percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. Sixty-six percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed (twenty-eight percent agreed or strongly agreed) that clear avenues of recourse are available to committees in the event committee recommendations are rejected or ignored by Faculty Council or the administration. Sixty-five percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they understand the policy-making role of the committee(s) they serve on; thirty-nine percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. In responding to Item 11, "Too many standing committees do little meaningful work," fifty-one percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed and forty-one percent disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Forty-five percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed (thirty-four percent agreed or strongly agreed) that some standing committees should have more ad hoc committees charged with developing policies and regulations. Fifty-six percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that some standing committees are ineffective due to lack of participation of their members while thirty percent disagreed or strongly disagreed; fourteen percent did not know or did not respond to the item. Item 14, "That standing committee assignments are

often chores to be tolerated rather than opportunities to bring about institutional change, "received the following responses: sixty-two percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed while thirty-five percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. Sixty-five percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed (twenty-seven percent disagreed or strongly disagreed) that standing committee work is too often rendered ineffective by the actions of other committes or administrative bodies. Item 16 which concerned whether classified staff members should have a role in the campus standing committee structure, received the following response: 42% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 38% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 20% did not know or did not respond.

Fifty-four percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that standing committees should make the important academic policy decisions for the college -- the implementation of which would be the role of administration; 38% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Forty-one percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed (39% agreed or strongly agreed) that there are areas in the operation of the Board of Trustees in which faculty should have voting membership. Forty-nine percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it is easy for new ideas about educational practice to receive a hearing at the standing committee level; 39% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Item 20, "Standing committee work is usually fruitless since major decisions are made sooner or later by administrators," received the following response: 52% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed and 41% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The following table lists additional information.

Table 2

Standing Committees of Faculty Council

8. Committe work is more often a device to give the appearance of faculty participation than a genuine effort to bring about change on our campus.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	20	47	4	0	71
%	28	66	6	0	100

9. Clear avenues of recourse are available to committees in the event committee recommendations are rejected or ignored by Faculty Council or the Administration.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	20	47	4	0	71
%	28	66	6	0	100

10. As a committee member, I understand what role the committee(s) I serve on play in policy decisions.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	46	22	1	2	71
%	65	31	1	3	100

11. Too many standing committees do little meaningful work.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	36	29	4	2	71
%	51	41	5	3	100

12. Some standing committees should have more ad hoc committees charged with developing policies and regulations.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	24	32	10	5	71
%	34	45	14	7	100

13. Some standing committees are ineffective due to lack of participation of their members.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	40	21	8	2	71
%	56	30	11	3	100

14. Standing committee assignments are often chores to be tolerated rather than opportunities to bring about institutional change.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	44	25	0	2	71
%	62	35	0	3	100

15. Standing committee work is too often rendered ineffective by the actions of other committees or administrative bodies. *If you agree with this statement, underline the one which particularly does this.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	46	19	4	2	71
%	65	27	5	3	100

16. Classified staff members should have a role in the campus standing committee structure.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	30	27	10	4	71
%	42	38	14	6	100

17. Standing committees should make the important academic policy decisions for the college -- the implementation of which would be the role of administration.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	38	27	3	3	71
%	54	38	4	4	100

18. There are areas in the operation of the Board of Trustees in which faculty should have voting membership. **If you agree with this statement, what areas would you suggest?

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	28	29	11	3	71
%	39	41	16	4	100

19. It is easy for new ideas about educational practice to receive a hearing at the standing committee level.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	35	28	4	4	71
%	49	39	6	6	100

20. Standing committee work is usually fruitless since major decisions are made sooner or later by administrators.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	37	29	2	3	71
%	52	41	3	4	100

Key: N = number of responses to each item
% = percentage of responses to each item
SA/A = strongly agree, agree
SD/D = strongly disagree, disagree
DK = don't know
NA = no answer

* 47 responses included the following: other committees, admininstrative bodies, Faculty Council, and Administrative Committee.

**29 responses included the following areas: matters of academic nature, areas concerned with welfare and well-being of faculty, all areas except determination of salary or termination and promotion, all areas.

Table 3 reflects the perceptions of the respondents regarding the feasibility of an alternative faculty representation in the policy decision-making process on HACC's campus. In response to Item 21, "As presently structured, the representative body of the faculty (Faculty Council) is effective in resolving most crisis situations which may arise within the faculty," 49% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed; 47% agreed or strongly agreed. Forty-eight percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed (37% agreed or strongly agreed) that an off-campus collective bargaining agency would be more effective in resolving crisis situations than our present representative body (Faculty Council) would be; 15% of the respondents did not know or did not respond to the item. The item stating that a collective bargaining agency should negotiate only salaries and/or working conditions received the following responses: 44% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, 41% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, and 15% did not know or did not respond to the item.

Sixty-five percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed (27% disagreed or strongly disagreed) that the representative body of the faculty (Faculty Council) should be the agent to resolve policy decisions in academic matters. In responding to Item 25, "Collective bargaining would enhance the position of faculty in our campus decision-making process," 48% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, 41% agreed or strongly agreed, and 13% did not know or did not respond to the item.

Table 3

Feasibility of an Alternative
Faculty Representative

21. As presently structured, the representative body of the faculty (Faculty Council) is effective in resolving most crisis situations which may arise within the faculty.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	33	35	1	2	71
%	47	49	1	3	100

22. An off-campus collective bargaining agency would be more effective in resolving crisis situations than our present representative body (Faculty Council) would be.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	26	34	6	5	71
%	37	48	8	7	100

23. A collective bargaining agency should negotiate only salaries and/or working conditions.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	29	31	6	5	71
%	41	44	8	7	100

24. The representative body of the faculty (Faculty Council) should be the agent to resolve policy decisions in academic matters.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	46	19	2	4	71
%	65	27	3	5	100

25. Considering items 23 and 24, collective bargaining would enhance the position of faculty in our campus decision-making process.

	SA/A	SD/D	DK	NA	Total
N	29	32	6	4	71
%	41	48	8	5	100

Key: N = number of responses to each item
% = percent of responses to each item
SA/A = strongly agree, agree
SD/D = strongly disagree, disagree
DK = don't know
NA = no answer

Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations

As stated elsewhere in this paper, Harrisburg Area Community College is one of three community colleges in Pennsylvania in which there is no formal bargaining structure for faculty; thus at HACC the faculty must depend upon the active participation of its Faculty Council in order to share in the policy decisions made on campus. As indicated in the findings of the Faculty Survey, a small majority of the respondents agreed that the Council is preferable to an external bargaining agency. It is not difficult to provide a rationale for faculty participation or authority since it is justifiable that those who must live with the policies and decisions should be involved in determining them -- equity demands that those affected by policy be a party to its determination. On the other hand, faculty must also accept the consequences of responsibility in the decision-making role and must be held accountable for decisions made -- which is difficult to do. It cannot automatically be assumed that Faculty Council represents any unified position of the faculty as a whole. Council could just as easily represent special interest groups. Further, if Faculty Council members are unable to see or to know the goals and needs of the institution as a whole, their judgment is not necessarily superior to that made on a higher level. It is also quite possible that individuals elected to the Council may view the position as simply another duty rather than an opportunity to share in the decision-making process.

Results of the Faculty Survey indicated that, in general, the faculty perceive the Council as being effective in most areas

of its dealings with administration. However, at the time of this writing, the members of the ad hoc Committee on Evaluation and Merit/Non-merit Pay are at an impasse with the college President who did not accept an Interim Report of the ad hoc committee. Thus the President issued an Alternative Report to the original proposal presented to him. The members of Faculty Council rejected portions of the President's Alternative Report and passed the ad hoc committee's Proposal No. 3 at its meeting on May 21, 1977. At Council's meeting June 27, 1977, the president of Faculty Council reported that the President of the college had rejected Council's Alternative Proposal No. 3. The president of Faculty Council stated that Alternative Report No. 2 was the the college President's compromise position and that if Council would not accept it, the college President would feel constrained to dissolve the ad hoc committee and continue under the existing system of evaluation and merit pay. Whether this matter will eventually cause a confrontation by Faculty Council and the Board of Trustees is yet to be determined. Findings of studies already cited support the view that salary is usually one of the reasons that faculty resort to collective bargaining. Presently, the above issue is not the only one which exists on which compromises must be made by either faculty or the administration.

Many of the comments made by respondents to the Faculty Survey (See Appendix B) cite apathy on the part of some faculty members on HACC's campus as being one of the reasons for the ineffectiveness of Faculty Council in some areas. Literature on the subject of collective bargaining supports the view that

in order for the representative body of faculty to meaningfully engage in decision making on a campus, faculty must be willing to be involved with its representative body.

In order to strengthen HACC's faculty representative body (Faculty Council), the following recommendations are made:

1. A report from the president of Faculty Council should be a part of every monthly agenda of the Board of Trustees. The Faculty Council president should report on any areas of concern of faculty members. In turn, the president of Faculty Council should report to the faculty any items of business conducted by the Board which concerned faculty. Thus direct communication links between faculty and the Board would be established; each group would benefit from the other's views as well as have direct access to any special concerns or potential problem areas.
2. Any policy recommendations developed by ad hoc or standing committees should be circulated to all faculty members sufficiently far enough in advance to allow faculty to study the recommendations, make comments, and/or attend the committee meeting. Minutes of all committee deliberations should be circulated as widely as practical.
3. All faculty members should actively participate in and contribute to the deliberations of one or more of the ad hoc committees or of the standing committees.
4. Faculty Council should have direct access to the Board of Trustees when a compromise cannot be reached between

faculty and administration.

5. While it would be inappropriate for faculty to serve as members of the Board of Trustees, faculty members should be appointed to those committees of the Board which would not cause a conflict of interest.
6. More ad hoc committees or task force structures should be established within the Council's committee structure. The temporary nature of the above arrangement might encourage more faculty involvement as opposed to serv- in on standing committees.

Much of the future success or failure of HACC's faculty involvement in the policy-making decision process will be determined by the faculty themselves. In any areas that involve matters concerning faculty, the representative body (Faculty Council) should be involved with the administration at an early stage in the decision-making process. It is unlikely that faculty can have substantial input otherwise. Channels of communication between faculty and administration should be open and used.

Bylsma and Blackburn succinctly state:

> In sum, a faculty must carefully examine its foundations and its prospects before selecting a means to alter its present condition. Similarly, an administration and a Board must assiduously survey the total terrain. When it finds it has rich ores already on hand, then avoid strip mining. Treat the faculty as the gems they are. Society will benefit when a setting is fostered which permits all to enjoy their splendor. 3:24

REFERENCES

1. Blocker, Clyde E., Louis W. Bender, and S. V. Martorana, The Political Terrain of American Postsecondary Education. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1975.

2. , Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

3. Bylsma, Donald and Robert T. Blackburn. Changes in Faculty Governance and Faculty Welfare: Some Empirical Consequences of Collective Negotiations. ERIC Document ED 058 882, 1971.

4. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

5. Gleaser, Edmund J., Jr. Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

6. Lieberman, Myron. Faculty Senates, A Dissenting View. ERIC Document ED 033 644, March, 1969.

7. McCabe, Robert H. Educational Policy Systems. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1973.

8. Roman, Paul A. San Diego City College Academic Senate: A Critical Evaluation. ERIC Document ED 021 548, June, 1968.

9. Stokle, J. Gerald. Non-Participatory Governance as an Influence on Faculty Senate Militancy. ERIC Document ED 103 044, July, 1974.

10. Wright, Stephen J., ed. Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. Report of the American Association for Higher Edcuation Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations. ERIC Document ED 018 218, 1967.

11. Yarrington, Roger, ed. Equal Opportunity for All: An Agenda for National Action. Report of the 1972 Assembly of the AACJC. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.

HACC PUBLICATIONS

1. Administration Committee Minutes, 1975-77.

2. Faculty Council Minutes, 1975-77.

3. Faculty Handbook, 1975-77.

4. Self-Study Report, 1977.

APPENDIX

Dear Colleague:

I have chosen the following topic for a practicum to complete the requirements of an Educational Policy Systems course in my work toward the Ed. D. at Nova University: Policy Formulation in a Non-Unionized Community College: An Assessment of the Role Played by the Representative Body of the Faculty (Faculty Council) in the Decision-Making Process.

I have limited the assessment to the period of September, 1975 to April, 1977.

As most of the statements on the survey indicate, I am concerned with your perception of the topic in three areas. I would appreciate candid answers as all information will be treated in an anonymous manner. In this way, I hope to identify any problem areas and suggested improvements.

After completing the survey, will you please fold, staple, and return it to me at S-123-B.

If you are interested in seeing a copy of the tabulated results, indicate this in writing.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Charlyne H. Moten

Faculty Survey

Using the following legend, please place your response in the blank.

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
SD - strongly disagree
D - disagree
DK - don't know
NA - no answer

PART I - ROLE OF FACULTY IN POLICY FORMULATION

_____ 1. Policy decision-making on this campus is decentralized.

_____ 2. There is wide faculty involvement in important decisions about how the college is run.

_____ 3. A concept of "shared governance" (faculty and administration arrive at decisions jointly) describes this campus fairly well.

_____ 4. The representative body (Faculty Council) of our faculty plays a more limited role in policy making than the administration plays.

_____ 5. The role our representative body (Faculty Council) plays in the decision-making process on our campus should be increased.

_____ 6. In Faculty Council debates, your opinions are adequately represented.

_____ 7. Some Faculty Organization meetings should be open to the entire campus community, but non-members should not be given the privilege of the floor.

PART II - THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF FACULTY COUNCIL

_____ 8. Committee work is more often a device to give the appearance of faculty participation than a genuine effort to bring about change on our campus.

_____ 9. Clear avenues of recourse are available to committees in the event committee recommendations are rejected or ignored by Faculty Council or the administration.

_____10. As a committee member, I understand what role the committee(s) I serve on play in policy matters.

_____11. Too many standing committees do little meaningful work.

_____12. Some standing committees should have more ad hoc committees charged with developing policies and regulations.

_____13. Some standing committees are ineffective due to lack of participation of their members.

_____14. Standing committee assignments are often chores to be tolerated rather than opportunities to bring about institutional change.

_____15. Standing committee work is too often rendered ineffective by the actions of other committees or administrative bodies. If you agree with this statement, underline the one which particularly does this.

16. Classified staff members should have a role in the campus standing committee structure.

17. Standing committees should make the important academic policy decisions for the college -- the implications of which would be the role of administration.

18. There are areas in the operation of the Board of Trustees in which faculty should have voting membership. If you agree with this statement, what areas would you suggest?

19. It is easy for new ideas about educational practice to receive a hearing at the standing committee level.

20. Standing committee work is usually fruitless since major decisions are made sooner or later by administration.

PART III - STRUCTURE OF FACULTY COUNCIL

21. As presently structured, the representative body of the faculty (Faculty Council) is effective in resolving most crisis situations which may arise within the faculty.

22. An off-campus collective bargaining agency would be more effective in resolving crisis situations than our present representative body would be.

23. A collective bargaining agency should negotiate only salaries and working conditions.

24. The representative body of the faculty (Faculty Council) should be the agent to resolve policy decisions in academic matters.

25. Considering items 23 and 24, collective bargaining would enhance the position of faculty in our campus decision-making process.

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

26. What do you consider to be the major strengths of our representative body (Faculty Council)?

27. Its major weaknesses?

28. What suggestions do you have for our representative body (Faculty Council) to give it more authority in the decision-making process on our campus?

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 17 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES